

OFFICE OF SECURITY FIELD CHIEFS

4 October 1979

. . . . as much attention to as any since I have been here, and which I feel is as important a responsibility as any, is the recruitment of new people. This is a marvelous Agency, it has had a history and a tradition of super people and we have probably the finest group of professionals that is in any organization of the government. But you cannot be in charge of it and not feel a great responsibility to see that that continues into the future. I therefore feel that paying attention to the recruiting, getting the right people on board is critical and you play a key role in that. I want you to know that it has my personal attention and support in any way we can for you.

Beyond that, your boss, Bob Gambino, gets more of my time and attention than he deserves. For reasons unrelated to him or to you, we in this country have more security problems today than we ought to have. Most of them are things you and I cannot do anything about. But the one thing that really bothers me when we talk about security problems, and I have done this--not here in OS--with groups like Mid-Career Courses that I talk to, and I go around the table and I say, what would you do to improve security? I get an answer, well, you have Congress pass a law. What would you do? Well, I'd have the Defense Department stop But I get exasperated and I say, what are you going to do with your office?

My philosophy is that security starts at your desk, at our desk, and it is discouraging to people when they know the leaks are coming from other places. But it does not alleviate the responsibility

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80B01554R003000340001-5
to take care of it in your desk, in your office, in your Directorate, whatever it may be in our Agency. I have to go brief that to the Congress, to the Defense Department, to the National Security Council, to everybody. If organizations will try to take care of its own thing, maybe we'll begin to chip away at the problem. We are putting an awful lot of attention on the work that the Office of Security has done on it. It has been super and with all the limits, problems, and impedences that we have got, we are doing a great deal.

The biggest and most important thing from our Agency's point of view, in my opinion, is to just tighten individual awareness of security. Again, the way you handle the security aspects of your jobs really is a critical part of this because it starts out there in the field when we try to make sure we don't get the lemon, the person who is going to turn unreliable, into the organization to begin with. Or we uncover aberrant behavior or whatever it may be that indicates massive problems of somebody who has been on board and is being reinvestigated.

Let me just one or two words about the overall state of the Agency today. I think we have lots of cause to be optimistic. Our product is good. Our product is well received around town. Our product is sought after by the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Brzezinski, and the President. We get lots of bad reports when we don't predict everything that happens in the world and you know, and I know, that is the fate of an intelligence organization. We have not been nearly as remiss as the press would say in Iran and particularly here in the Cuban situation. The President has stoutly defended the fact that there is not an intelligence failure in this crisis. You will note in contrast

to Iran that the Administration has not gone around slicing itself up as they did trying to make us the scapegoat. There is no question that was all internal backbiting that hurt us in Iran. The President laid down the word here that he had gone through this and thought that we had done a good job.

The point at stake here is that we weren't trying to find 2,000-3,000 Soviets who were the only Soviets in Cuba; we weren't trying to find the 40 Soviet tanks that were the only Soviet tanks in Cuba; or the 68 APCs that were the only ones in Cuba. We were trying to distinguish between the 8,000 or 9,000 Soviets who were in Cuba and the 700 to 800 tanks and the 700 to 900 APCs that are in Cuba whether those portions of them were allocated to this purpose of being a combat unit training for combat rather than teaching Cubans. We work in this game in a set of priorities that are set by others and the record of attention to Cuba in general, the Soviet ground forces in Cuba as opposed to missiles and ships and airplanes, is one of not keen interest over the last dozen years. What brought us to the conclusion we have come to was a classic intelligence operation in which communications intelligence told us what to look for. When we got the pictures we knew what we were looking at because of what we got in communications and because of all this we had gone out and asked one of our human agents to verify a portion of this and he did it, nailed it down for us and within a few days in late August it all came together. It has been exciting and it has been indicative of the kind of real success that we can have when we apply our talents across the board here.

We are collecting good intelligence today. We are collecting it with the vastly improving technical systems. They are bringing in so

much data that one of our new challenges is how to process and handle it, massage it, and retrieve it because it defies getting humans to handle it all. We have got to do it with computers. It is a real challenge. In spite of a lot of the stories you read, John McMahon, the head of the DDO, will tell you that last year was the best year on record for the DDO in terms of productivity. Now all these complaints that we have fired everybody, the morale is low, and all that kind of thing is exaggerated in the first place. In the second place, the thing that pays off is does the product come in. We have more agents recruited last year than we did the year before and the year before that and they are doing very well. On top of that, I believe they are even more responsive today to fitting into where we need them. You don't try to solve all the answers with the spys. You try to solve the answers you can't get pictures of with a satellite or you can't get a signals intercept on, because those are easier, cheaper, less risky. We are doing, I think, a better job in teamwork, in dovetailing those elements together.

Finally, I would say from my vantage point our position with the public, with the Congress, with the Administration is stronger and we have more support today by far than we had when I was privileged to join you two and a half years ago. I just came back a couple of weeks ago from seven 3-hour testimonies on the Hill about Cuba--back-to-back in a week--and the thrust of this was not, why did you goof off; it was, why didn't you ask for more money, why didn't you ask for more people, why didn't you have a better intelligence, we want more intelligence. And that, I tell you, is a stark contrast to a couple of years ago. You get that in the public arena yourself. Look at what has been in the

press the last year as compared with a couple of years ago when we were still reading about MKULTRA and everything they could dig out. Now there is still the guy who lashes out at us. There is Joe Trento who wants to make a saint out of Paisley and Paisley was a great guy, but Trento won't let him go until he makes a Pulitzer Prize on the Paisley story I guess. But, overall, the tone has certainly shifted in our direction.

I am sorry I missed my appointed schedule with you this morning because I was down looking at whether and how we are going to get more money into our next budget. We had a meeting with all the top people downtown and the President promised in his speech the other night and Monday we're going to do more surveillance in Cuba, we are going to improve our capabilities for looking at Cuban-Soviet affairs around the world. I snuck the word capabilities in, he had something else in there when the first draft came out. You do those things a little bit here and a little bit there and we're moving along. We will meet with the President on that question tomorrow. I met with him yesterday on it as a matter of fact privately, but we'll have a overall meeting with him on it tomorrow. There is not going to be a pot of gold, you are not suddenly going to find your staffs are doubled and all this kind of thing, I don't want to overdo it. I am just trying to say to you that the climate, the atmosphere, the trends are all in a better and a more healthy direction for us. I find the attitudes around the Agency are healthier overall. I think we have every opportunity to do what all of us want to do and that is to ensure that we are each making a contribution, not only for today but for the next decade; that when we leave feel that we have done something that will help to ensure the country

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80B01554R003000340001-5
has the CIA and making 1989 as good as it is in 1979. I talked longer
than I wanted to, let's start and see what you have got on your mind.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Q: From time to time the media addresses the question of the wisdom
of having the DDO type operation continue to be wedded with the NFAC
type operation in the same organization and we hear voices raised
from time to time about separating those two. Any comment on where
that might stand at this point?

A: That is a very minor set of.....has never come up in the Congressional hearing, for instance. That is where you would find it
bubbling if there was really some steam behind it; that is something
I never have to pay any attention to. The one that people raise a
little more than that is should the covert action portion of the DDO
be segmented off into a--and nobody says where. The Defense Department
doesn't want it, State Department certainly doesn't want it, so do
you create now "The Covert Action Agency" out here? That is just
the thing the liberals who propose trying to get rid of it out of
here wouldn't want. I answer that one quickly because if you had
a whole agency to deal with covert action, you'd probably end up
with some covert action--bureaucrats find work to do and we, I
think, keep it in balance, in proportion is the words that are
needed. I have no concern about somebody fragmenting off the DDO.
This is not a problem.

A: The size of the so-called combat brigade in Cuba seems to be relatively
small. What is the threat?

Q: There is no military threat to the United States. There is a theoretical military threat to Central America or Latin America if they were to be bold enough to inject it into some revolutionary situation. It only took a couple of dozen Cubans to turn the tide in Nicaragua in our opinion and thethey represented. We think the Cuban participation in Nicaragua was crucial but small. The Sandinistas a year ago last month almost made it. They didn't make it; it was the Cuban help between then and the spring and then at the critical moment in the spring that made the second go successful for them. Now, if you look on the broader scale, what it represents is a Cuban-Soviet alliance, an earnest of Soviet support for these Cuban activities in Angola, Ethiopia, Yemen, and who knows where next. Ironically we say it is not a training unit, there are a lot of people who I think understand if we say it would be a greater threat if it were a training unit. If it were really cranking out Cuban mercenaries in big order and sending them all around the world, we would have more to be worried about than a bunch of guys with tanks and mortars in Cuba.

Q: Would you comment, Admiral Turner, on the cooperation you are getting currently from the Community?

A: I think it has improved. I didn't talk about the Community very much but I put a lot of my personal time in this office in being the DCI as opposed to being head of our Agency. The President felt, when he appointed me, and I have felt since I've been here, that it is important that we bring the Community closer together. The President gave me authority over the budgets and when it came to the

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80B01554R003000340001-5

question, are we going to get a supplemental as the result of the President's speech, there was no question in anybody's mind that it was the DCI who was going to pull that supplemental together and, boy, they all came in with their suggestions, their requests--it totaled \$600 million, we have to pare it down obviously. I did that with nobody contesting, "You can't decide whether NSA's thing goes above CIA's." So that is working well. We really do have control of the budget process and I think the other agencies recognize that it is working better for them in this way. We got a good hearing and instead of a committee voting, and committees don't vote because it is logical, I can look at them now around a table and I say, now knock off that crap, don't give me that stuff, tell me what you really need, because I'm going to back it up with this fellows. If you don't put a convincing case forward, he's going to win. Whereas before, when it was a committee they were playing to, it was histrionics and wasn't useful debate. The action in Cuba, dovetailing the communications, the photos, and the human intelligence, that wasn't one agency, that was three organizations that had to pull that off. So, we're not there yet. People don't want, in my opinion, a DCI. Nobody wants to give up anything to more centralized control. I don't want to take control for the sake of control, but there are a lot of voids that aren't being filled. My office has been involved in one that is going to be very much a concern of the Office of Security. We handled it outside of the Security Office thus far, and that is setting up a whole new codeword system. Our codeword system is a mess. Why? Because NSA developed one, the Reconnaissance Office developed another, the HUMINT people never developed

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80B01554R003000340001-5

one. If you are a contractor and want to send this document in-- if it is under the NSA rules, you wrap it three times and seal it twice; and if it is under the NRO rules, you wrap it twice and seal it three times. We had a conference on that last week and I asked the contractors, does this bother you that you have manuals from different people telling you how to do the same thing? They said Si, it just screws us all up, we have to have contracts with both organizations. So we are trying to fill some of these necessary voids, not just grab all the power and do things. We're trying to step in where there is a need for more coordination. It comes gradually. In some areas like the budget, it is just working great. Other areas they fight me tooth and nail over the most minute kind of thing, you just can't believe it.

Q: Are we making any progress in the legislative arena as far as relaxing requirements of the FOIA and Privacy Act as far as the CIA is concerned?

A: Yes. I'm sorry I didn't bring it with me but there is a sentence in the President's speech on this and it says we are going to take steps to safeguard our sources and methods of collecting intelligence. What I have proposed, and it came down to that one sentence, was the rapid submission of the FOIA relief legislation. Legislation to make it a criminal offense to willingly disclose the identity of undercover CIA personnel and legislation to let us more easily get protective orders in a court case so that classified information can be utilized but not exposed, protected. The defense can see it but they can't talk about it and so on. Those are three pieces of

legislation that we are working on. I don't want you to hope that this is going to be passed before Christmas because it isn't. All of this is helping and there is more pressure on today than there was before and now it is welling out of the Congress. We've got several Bills on these same subjects from the Congress coming back, some of those aren't quite acceptable to us but out of it I think we have a claimant where we have a 40 percent chance of getting something next year; whereas six months ago it was a 15 percent chance. Maybe by January I'll even be over the 50 percent mark.

Q: I started to ask along that same line, where do you see the Congress going on charter legislation, if anywhere?

A: That is a really tough one. We're getting pretty close with the Senate committee on agreement here. There are just a few things that are still real strong feelings between us that are different. The House has just not paid attention to it yet and clearly they don't want to just rubber stamp a Senate thing no matter how good it is. As you would appreciate, even though we get agreement with the Senate committee, there is going to be the right-wingers who say its too restrictive and the left-wingers who say it doesn't restrict us at all. There is a real danger of getting caught in that cross-fire and stymied. I think that would be bad for us. I really do and let me say, oversight by the Congress, charters by the Congress is a very controversial subject. I am going to the lion's den tomorrow at Noon and speak to the AFIO crowd who think charters are the end of the world--I believe anyway from what I have read of some of their things. I'm going to tell them as I tell you that I think the

charter has more benefit to us than problem as long as we keep some of the things out, and there are only a couple of things left that I will bleed over. We have worked it now to where it is reasonable. We know where we stand. We have also got firm things in there about what we are supposed to do--it is a charter to do as well as a charter to control. I also want to be sure everybody appreciates that it sets out what is the oversight procedure. But we do have to continue working and it is going alright right now, but we have to worry in the future that oversight not become management. This charter will spell out the oversight role, if you see what I mean. It is good to have that spelled out for us. Beyond that, we can never forget that while I think we are getting much more public support for what we do, there is still a public suspicion of what we do that we don't do but they think we do or might do. If the charters just flounder for years now, that suspicion will continue more so I think than it will if we get the charters through.

Q: On a much more pedestrian level, let me just make a comment. My men, definitely in [REDACTED], appreciate the little personal notes you will write, notes of thanks after you have visited our area, to the point that some men even say occasionally, when is the Admiral coming? Which is very unusual.

A: Thank you. I should have mentioned that in my remarks but I really do appreciate the support that I get wherever I travel because, and I say this with great sincerity, I have never felt, let alone ever voiced, a complaint about the performance of anybody in your organization. Now I'm talking about the super guys who are assigned to

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80B01554R003000340001-5

my security staff. They rotate through on two-year tours so I've seen a lot of them now. And when I go out in the field and your people support me there, nobody has ever missed knowing where to go, missed being thoughtful, courteous, trying to find any possible way to help us. And I really appreciate it. I know it is a burden when you've got all these other things going on and it takes away from your efforts. I don't want to more of a burden than necessary. I don't really want you to put more people on my travel operations than absolutely necessary to do the job.

Q: Admiral, one of the cases that is having a real debilitating effect on people around the Community that are working the leak problem is the Jack Anderson case. He seems to be just, you know, he's thrown the gauntlet down and publicly announced that he has all these classified documents and, as you know, we have identified the ones he has and so on. Is there any hope that Justice will move on that thing either criminally or civilly?

A: Well we had a Community leader breakfast this morning and that was a subject we talked about for 10 minutes, specifically Jack Anderson. And yes, there is opposition in the Justice Department to prosecuting him for having had possession of these. We are working with them on an alternative which is to prosecute for the return of the documents. I think anything to show that you don't let this blatant violation of security procedures go unattended would be worthwhile. So I can't promise you we'll make it even on the fallback position, but I can only say that we are working it, we're trying hard. We've got a new Attorney General, that is a setback. The old one was very

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80B01554R003000340001-5

supportive. I have no reason to think Ben Civiletti won't be equally, but he steps in, he's new, I can't go and ask him to take sort of major steps all in the first month or two he is in office. We're working on these things with him. He was very cooperative as the Deputy over there, but it is going to take a little while to feel out how aggressive he will be in the national security area.

Q: I was going to say, would you say that reorganization of the Agency has reached a point where we're satisfied with the system now or are we still planning on big changes in the future?

A: No, I haven't any changes of any great significance in mind at this time. Just working over this morning a proposal on something called the Executive Committee we set up 4, 5, 6 months ago. I found that there was no regular forum for me to sit around the table with the Agency leaders and say, how do we attack this problem from an Agency point of view? I have a morning meeting three times a week but they come with the daily problems thing not, how do we tackle a major issue that confronts us? So we set up the Executive Committee of the four Deputy Directors, the DDCI and myself to do that. Well, this morning we're talking about where does the Executive Secretary of the Executive Committee report. He used to report to the Comptroller, but that was because Jim Taylor was the guy I wanted to run the Executive Committee. Now he has moved to DDS&T and so we have to relocate or decide if we leave in the Comptroller the Executive Committee function. So around here but I haven't for I guess for over a year now had anything in mind in terms of any major structural reorganization. This morning we announced a small.....

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80B01554R0003000340001-5

in the NIOs, the National Intelligence Officers. They're a collegial group up there of a dozen or fourteen people, each with one or two assistants, and we now put Dick Lehman in charge of coordinating them. One guy puts his priority on working interagency memos, another on Agency memos, for they work for both the Agency and the Community. We are just trying to get it a little focused is all. If those things bother you, that will go on forever. you want to propose? While I don't have any in mind I'm What I am trying to say to you is I've neither a hidden plan or some inner drive to keep changing the organization. But I hope I'm a progressive in the sense that if I can see a good idea, I'm willing to try. What would you like to have organized?

Response: I was thinking in terms of continuity and stability and the good feeling that goes with a dedicated, spirited organization.

A: Well, continuity, stability

Response: And good productivity too.

A: I can't guarantee my continuity as I read in the paper every day that I'm being fired. Nobody has ever suggested it to me at any official level. I can only assure you that I have worked for the government all my life and I'm willing to do it as long as my superiors want me to. I survived the.... (tape turned) I've never worked in my life; I've been in the government all this time. Like to go out and try the other side too. I would like to see more continuity and one of the things I'm really trying to do to promote that is emphasize personnel management. If you look carefully behind some of the

personnel moves that have just taken place around the top levels here, there is a method in my madness. You take Jim Taylor who was the Comptroller, super guy. But his field was only Comptroller, that is all he has ever done for us. Putting him in DDS&T, in a couple of years now I've got a horse I can put a lot of places, right? You take Ev Hineman, who is out of the weapons part of NFAC up in the number 2 job, so he is not getting into economics and politics; and I've got another horse here. You take John McMahon, who has been in DDS&T, been in OTS, now he is running the DDO. I don't want to get too much into personalities here, but I'm just saying that if you move people around a little bit, you don't get put in a situation I was put in, in my opinion--I may be wrong--when Hank Knoche retired. I didn't feel I had a suitably experienced candidate for that job. And the same when the DDA left. And I don't ever want to be caught where when any one of the Deputy Directors, Associate Deputy Directors, or DDCIs leave, that there aren't two or three candidates, because I, my successors, somebody else may not like the cut of your jibe, I may not like people with blue ties. That is irrational but okay. Or, if you only have one candidate and he decides to die, you are in tough shape. So I'm trying and I want you to try that. I want this to go through the Agency, that we all look after our people. Who's going to be the [REDACTED] guy next, if you've got 4 or 5 candidates for it.

Really, I suppose Bob is thinking of all your [REDACTED] offices here. Has he got enough candidates coming up so when it is your time to move on to higher things, to retire, shift to another Directorate, whatever it may be, that he has groomed people who have had the

STATINTL

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80B01554R003000340001-5

variety of experience, the kind of training courses that will qualify them. It's really very much needed. I'll be candid with you. We have been four agencies too long. We've been too cloistered, too compartmented. I have threatened this for two years now and one of these very soon days I'm going to break the bureaucracy and order it. The day is going to come when you don't make supergrade if you haven't served outside your Directorate. Now don't get scared if you're not a supergrade. I'm not going to just say that and you all get ruled out. We'll phase it in over a period of time. It probably won't affect many people of your stature at all, but it will affect those GS-12s coming along here because somewhere between there and GS-15, the good ones are going to demand to do that. And why? Because the top managers have got to understand more than one strain of the organization. When you get to be a supergrade, you represent the organization, you don't represent a Directorate or an office. I have leaned on Bob probably as tough as anybody in the organization since I've been here. We were only here a few months when he really got me interested in the Boyce-Lee case. Right, Bob? What he has accomplished since we really got mean about the Boyce-Lee case is really substantial. Last week we had the contractor security people in and the time I spent with them I was very impressed. I was very impressed with their cooperativeness, their recognition that we were about this problem, and their willingness to get in and help. And their gratefulness for the attention that you have given them, which includes surprise inspections and a lot of things that people aren't normally happy with but you're doing because they've got to be done. We had the unfortunate Kampiles case and I saw a little

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP80B01554R003000340001-5

bit of Bob on that one. He spearheaded a super report on that. It almost did what you've suggested. It might have made him DDCI (Security) but, seriously, it was a good report. We've put a lot of it into action and some things we're still trying to find ways to accomplish. So we've had a lot of interface, Bob and I have, and things have always been responsive and that's the hallmark of your organization. We're appreciative of it. It is just an essential part of this business. You cannot have intelligence without security. I don't need to preach that to you, but I think we are getting more and more attention to that and it is going to pay off. I give a speech tonight to the National Security Industrial Association and half of it is on security; FOIA I mention, FOIA legislation, give examples of how we've put 2 man-years per year for the last three years on Agee. I tell them it is ridiculous this government has a man who says he wants to tear down and disestablish a legal, authorized paid for organ of the government and we have two men, full-time, working to provide him help doing that. Now I don't mind paying for guys who want to know whether we've got their names in the files and said something nasty about them or something like that. We're a free society and the citizens deserve to know what is going on. But when the fellow's avowed purpose is to thwart what the Congress and the President have authorized and we help him with it, we're almost insane. We're taking the time to drive these things home to the public these days so we get that support that will carry the necessary legislation to the Congress. But let me come back, it's the kind of work you do that is the cornerstone of this and we have got to have security at every step along the way. So I hope you will help me

preach. Don't look just for the Congress to solve the security problem that the country has got. If we'll each just worry about our own security problems, whatever our own sphere is, it will all piece together in due course and we'll improve the situation. It is just very injurious to our profession, to our contribution to the country if we can't tighten up in a lot of these areas. I know a lot of it is not within our particular purview and we're working on that also, but let's all keep going in our own area and do the job as you all do it so well in your sphere. I'm grateful to you and thanks for the time.